



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## THE PROBLEM OF SYNDICALISM—DISCUSSION

KARL RATHGEN: Mr. Brooks's paper is so largely political in character that I can speak on it only reluctantly. I have not the presumption to tell Americans what attitude they should take in regard to a movement which is essentially a political one. To an economist the first question must be: what is the character and strength of syndicalism? To a German economist it is striking that syndicalism seems to be essentially of national character, having its origin and strength mainly in France and Italy. With Sombart I think that this comes not only from national character, but also from the less advanced economic condition of those countries. Syndicalism and kindred anarchistic movements have never taken hold of the German workingmen to any extent. One may find something of the kind in the so-called locally organized unions, which have never had real influence, and in the case of want of discipline in starting inconsiderate strikes, which the centralized unions mostly succeed in putting down (*e.g.* the strike in the Hamburg shipyard last summer).

Mr. Brooks has pointed out the inherent weakness and lack of organization of syndicalism. I quite agree with him here, and when he sees in syndicalism a part of the great movement of unrest. But I cannot follow him when he asks for sympathy with a movement because we do not know what will come out of it. His analogies do not seem to me convincing. If the Grangers asked for control of railways, for a parcel post, and an income tax, these were in themselves not new, and they remain entirely within our economic system. If, as contrasted with industrial copartnership and the self-governing workshop, consumers' coöperation has succeeded, it is because this also is carried on, to a large extent, on the basis of our economic system and has not tried to do away with the wages system. Syndicalism comes back to the utopian idea of the self-governing workshop and underestimates entirely the strength of our economic system. I can see in syndicalism only a passing phase of the social movement. That part of it which has vital force must come over to the discipline and organization which has made a power of trade unionism. That part of it which persists in its utopian ideas must pass away in consequence of its own lack of organized efficiency.

M. B. HAMMOND: There are four questions concerning syndicalism which I desire to ask, and to answer as fully as possible, in

the few minutes assigned to me: (1) What is the explanation of the appearance of such a movement as syndicalism at this time? (2) What are the aims of the syndicalists? (3) How effective are likely to be the methods which they employ? (4) What should be the attitude of students of economics, interested in social reform, toward this movement?

1. I think we may say that syndicalism was born of the social unrest which has been such a noticeable element in the history of the first decade of the twentieth century. It is not a matter of pure chance that we have such a revolutionary movement appearing side by side with similar outbursts on the part of the militant suffragettes and on the part of embittered trade unionists like the structural ironworkers. In all these movements we find the same characteristics: first, the presence of a high ideal, to reach which, it is argued, one must be guided by feelings rather than by cold reason; second, impatience of delay; third, a desire to avoid political complications with their necessary compromises and their shrewd diplomacy. Instead, there is a determination to use direct action, which hits somebody and therefore gets results. The rising tide of syndicalism, with its warlike methods, is, therefore, in part due to the same influences which have animated the social reformers of all classes. Its peculiar manifestation is due largely to the leadership of a class of men who have never before participated in a revolutionary movement, and who have not learned the futility of such outbursts. Mr. Brooks has told us in his book on *American Syndicalism* that the leaders of the I.W.W. are mostly young men. I found the same thing to be true of the leaders of the radical parties in New Zealand and Australia. The New Zealand Federation of Labor, the "Red Feds" as this organization is called, which has been responsible for the general strike which only recently has befallen this "country without strikes," is composed almost entirely of young men who did not pass through the great maritime strike of 1890 which preceded the enactment of a compulsory arbitration law.

The resort to violent means is due, however, not only to the natural impatience of delay which affects young men, but is, I think, in large part to be explained by the fact that the great trade union movement, which has done so much in the latter half of the nineteenth century to better the condition of skilled laborers, has done little or nothing to improve the condition of the great masses of the workers—the unskilled and the semi-skilled. Industrial unionism, as contrasted with trade unionism, has done

something to improve the lot of these men, but even industrial unionism assumes a permanency of employment within a given industry, which does not exist for the majority of the workers.

2. When we come to discuss the aims of the syndicalists, or what constitutes their program of reform, we find that we must distinguish between their *destructive* and their *constructive* plans. It is their plans for destroying the existing order which have challenged the attention of outsiders, and which have received the most emphasis on the part of even those within the movement. We need not, I think, spend much time in discussing the futility of riots and sabotage in bringing about a better condition of society. When we turn to consider the constructive side of their program, it is then that we meet with the greatest disappointment. We find that there is no well-thought-out method of reform. No advance is made by the syndicalists on the old idea of coöperative societies, and syndicalists have not shown any appreciation of the weaknesses which these attempts at coöperation revealed. In fact, the syndicalist even emphasizes the importance of the very things which proved the destruction of the old coöperative movement. That movement failed, primarily, because it did not recognize the value of organizing and managing ability and offered no encouragement to men having capacity for organization. Syndicalism rests on the same fallacy. The syndicalist does not believe that any one person has greater capacity to rule than has the mass of workers. Mass rule is, according to the syndicalist, always superior to individual rule, only it is not the rule of the majority which the syndicalist emphasizes but the rule of the so-called "moral active minority."

The syndicalists' idea of the necessity of class conflict leads nowhere. Conflict, as all sociologists know, is of value as a social force only when it leads to toleration, but the conflict which the syndicalists preach is simply destructive in its nature. If the workers win their fight against the capitalists by their methods of riot, sabotage, etc., the exploited merely become the exploiters. The workers may gain control of the industrial establishments, but syndicalism does not tell us how they would use them.

3. As to the syndicalists' methods, they are doubtless effective in creating annoyance, but they certainly do not convince us that they can create anything else. The general strike, or even a strike of all workers in the transport industries, is doubtless a powerful weapon, but such experience with its use as we have had shows

that it recoils with especial severity upon those who discharge it. Furthermore, the syndicalists are mistaken in their idea that the only antagonism which is going on in the economic world is that between the workers and the capitalists. The struggle going on between competing establishments in the same industry, and between different industries is just as keen as that between the masters and their workers, and the remuneration of the workers in any given industry is as much dependent upon the prices paid for the materials used by that industry and upon the prices secured for its products as it is upon the distribution of the returns between wages on the one hand and interest and rent on the other. The shrewdest of the leaders have, of course, observed this fact and have attempted to provide for it by their scheme of a "federated administration," but this is little more than a suggestion and can hardly be regarded as an essential part of the syndicalist program.

4. More important than anything else which we can discuss is our answer to the question of what shall be our attitude toward the syndicalist movement. Shall we give our support only to the repressive methods which have been practiced in most communities in which syndicalists have appeared; to the efforts not only to check displays of violence, but to forbid freedom of speech on the part of syndicalists? These are the ordinary police methods, and, to a certain extent, I suppose we shall have to recognize their legitimacy. To the authorities of a state or municipality, pledged above all else to maintain order, there is little time to reflect or philosophize as to the ultimate effects of such methods, and doubtless we would all favor some repression and some punishment of law breakers and of those who incite lawlessness, in order to protect society against anarchy. The fact nevertheless remains that the pressure being brought to bear upon the masses of the workers by the failure of wages to keep pace with the increase in cost of living has left them with no further power than this violent mode of resistance, this blind striking in the dark. The trade union movement, as we have said, is utterly unsuited, by its method of organization, to assist this class of workers. It assumes a unity and identity of interests which do not exist among the unskilled. Weak as the syndicalist movement is in its philosophy and in its program of reform, it is calculated to excite sympathy rather than criticism on our part. Ramsay MacDonald's description of syndicalism as "the impatient, frenzied, thoughtless child of poverty, disappointment, irresponsibility" is not only an

accurate definition of the movement, but it shows us why its followers are deserving of sympathy in their fatuous efforts to demolish and reconstruct the social order. If the syndicalist movement does nothing more than to spur on present-day reformers to urge the adoption of practical remedies for specific social diseases—such remedies as the minimum wage, workmen's compensation, sickness insurance, old age pensions, labor exchanges, industrial education, and vocational guidance, all of which have been sufficiently tried to demonstrate their usefulness—it will have produced more good than it has of harm. All these reforms are calculated to be directly beneficial to the unskilled and semi-skilled workers and, to the extent to which they are adopted, they all tend to remove the causes which have produced this revolutionary movement.

Furthermore, syndicalism may do something toward enabling certain leaders in business enterprises to see the need of more moderate reforms and to offer less resistance to the adoption of such a social program as most social reformers are now undertaking to carry through. It is unfortunate that their attention has to be called to the need of reform by such violent methods as syndicalists preach and practice, but it is perhaps better that it should be called to their attention in this way than not at all. Syndicalism, as Mr. Brooks justly says, is "just as legitimate and desirable as outside critical and protesting opinion ever has been." It seems, furthermore, as legitimate as the tactics which recent congressional investigation shows the National Association of Manufacturers to have used, and while corruption on one side may not be sufficient excuse for violence on the other side, the fact that corrupt methods breed violence may serve to teach a useful lesson.

Another point which I wish to mention before closing, but which I cannot, of course, develop, is that while syndicalism has no constructive program to offer it may nevertheless point the way to a real solution of our present industrial problem. The ideal of coöperative production carried through by private industries seems to me far better than that of socialized production through the agency of a state monopoly. While syndicalism does not itself show us how this coöperation is to be secured, it does indicate some reaction from the strong socialistic tendency of the last quarter century. Our modern corporations have proved fairly efficient in carrying on production, and have at the same time exemplified the possibility of the coöperation of large numbers.

The next step in our industrial evolution would seem to be to secure democratic control of these corporations and to give to the workers in them an opportunity to share in this control. In this way we should be securing what the syndicalists are striving for, and industrial democracy would come about through natural evolution rather than through violent revolution.

R. F. HOXIE: The leading paper, if I grasp its spirit, is essentially an appeal for an open-minded and tolerant attitude toward syndicalism, both because of its character and larger relationships and because of its imminence as a practical problem.

I heartily second this appeal for open-mindedness but on quite other grounds, viz., that it is only by considering syndicalism in an unprejudiced, matter-of-fact, scientific spirit that we can get at the real character of the problem which it presents to us and wisely regulate our conduct with respect to it.

Approaching the problem in this spirit it seems to me that we have to consider at least three questions before we can reach any valid conclusions: (1) What is the nature of syndicalism? (2) What is its strength in the labor movement? (3) What are the causes of it and the prospects for its future development? It is impossible for me, without greatly overstepping the time limit, to discuss adequately any of these essential questions, but a few suggestive statements in regard to each of them may not be altogether amiss.

With respect to the nature of syndicalism I am bound to recognize the validity of the concrete attributes by means of which Mr. Brooks attempts to identify it, but I am inclined to question both the general syndicalist concept which he appears to derive from these attributes and some of the implications which in his mind seem to attach to it.

Mr. Brooks nowhere specifically defines syndicalism and one must infer from the paper under discussion that it does not appeal to him as in the nature of a definite, concrete entity. Rather it appears to be, according to his inception, an intangible, spiritual something—a state of mind, but so comprehensive, so shifting, and so shadowy in its outlines that one can never be sure what it is exactly and what it is not—a nebulous cloud enshrouding and permeating the all-inclusive radical movement.

If we accept this concept, Mr. Brooks has us at a peculiar disadvantage in any attempt to appeal to facts in order to combat his conclusions. If we attempt to show how atomistic, and there-

fore organically ineffective, syndicalism is, he has only to point out how strong it will be when it sweeps all the workers into one big, centralized union. If we bring forward facts to show that the syndicalist ideal, as we know it, is losing ground, he has but to reply that this means merely that the syndicalists are becoming opportunistic and reformist.

Now with all due respect for Mr. Brooks's intent, his open-mindedness, and his remarkable intimacy with the facts of the labor movement, it does seem to me that he has thus enwrapped the subject for discussion in a mystical cloud which completely befogs the issue. If we are to reach any practically valid conclusions in regard to syndicalism and the problem which it presents to us, we must, I believe, treat it in an every-day, matter-of-fact spirit,—if not as a concrete, organic entity, or movement, then at least as a fairly definite theory and mode of action.

But in so far as we do this we seem bound to deny the main implications which flow from Mr. Brooks's conception of it. He tells us that:

The I. W. W. is first a part of the whole syndicalist movement of the world as that is also a part of the whole socialistic and politically radical defection against the economic and political order of our time. . . . This larger revolt includes anarchists, communists, socialists, single taxers, and a most formidable contingent of radical politicians the world over. If in some color scheme this protesting multitude could be mapped out, syndicalism would have its own tint differentiating it a little from anarchy and communism, more from socialism and collectivism, but so shading into all of them as to baffle the hardest attempt to preserve outlines. . . .

What is not, however, to be overlooked is that in time of strife these bodies will help each other. As in time of arms laws are silent, they will forget all theoretic variations when struggle is on. If in future the contests with capitalism are to be more frequent and more bitter, the inclusive total of this revolt will act together on the firing line to such extent as to obscure all the solemnities of separate programs.

The implication here seems to be that it is impossible to examine and judge syndicalism apart from the general radical labor and political movement; that it is imbued with all the importance of that movement and partakes of its general imminence; and that if we are inclined at all to take radical medicine for our social ills we must, perforce, swallow syndicalism with the rest of the bolus, for, "however uncouth, syndicalism is a part of this shifting equilibrium." In short, Mr. Brooks seemingly denies us anything of the nature of revolutionary choice.

Now this appears to place syndicalism before the student in a manner that is neither warranted by the facts in the case nor by



the scientific demand for an unprejudiced attitude. It is a far cry from the recognition of a certain community of needs and interests among all factors of the radical group to an implication that all must or will adopt common theories and methods of action. Can we even assume that all of those who subscribe to the notion of class conflict are bound to sanction every new conflict theory or to adopt the means proposed by the latest shortsighted or super-radical group? On the contrary, I believe that it may be affirmed without fear of contradiction from close students of the labor movement, that such vital differences of environment, and therefore of problems, needs, and viewpoint, exist between the more divergent sections of the radical group as to make present conscious identity of purpose and action, or even mutual aid, practically impossible. This is true whether our line of demarcation be either social or national. And even if we adopt the view that industrial development is surely wiping out the differences of conditions, needs, and problems that now exist, socially or nationally, between the divergent sections of the radical group, so that unity of radical viewpoint and method may be looked upon as a future possibility, there is still wanting proof that such union will take place on the basis of the most militant theory and program. At present, indeed, at least in this country, the weight of evidence seems altogether against the assumption that if there is to be a union of radical elements it will be on the line of syndicalist theory and action.

Mr. Brooks's apparent denial of revolutionary choice, in his effort to define and place syndicalism, appears then to elevate it to a position of undue importance and to attach to it a certain honorific quality unwarranted by the facts. All of which starts us out in our efforts to comprehend and deal with the problem somewhat overawed by syndicalism and prejudiced in its favor,—things which, if we are seeking the truth, are to be avoided quite as carefully as their antitypes, which Mr. Brooks is evidently attempting to exorcise.

If now we put aside this mystical attitude and approach syndicalism as a definite, concrete thing from which the protecting mantle of general radicalism has been withdrawn, how important really is it? In other words, what is its actual strength as a factor in the labor movement? In attempting to answer this question I shall confine myself strictly to the situation in this country, first, because I have no first-hand knowledge of the European situation, and, secondly, because I believe the problem of syndicalism, so far as it touches us vitally, is after all a national one.

To my mind there can be no doubt that as a people we have been led or frightened into a tremendous overestimate of the importance of the syndicalist element in the American labor movement. I think it can be shown that not only has syndicalism never infected any considerable body of American workmen but that it is today losing strength and influence with organized labor in this country. If we consider the various organic elements of the American labor movement these statements are not difficult of proof.

We are told first that syndicalism was a "propelling force in the meteoric career of the Knights of Labor." I seriously doubt the validity of this statement, but if it is true it is also true that the Knights of Labor has been utterly repudiated by American workmen.

Secondly, if we look to the socialist party, which from the beginning has fought craft unionism and has endeavored to arouse American laborers into class consciousness, we find that it has taken care by constitutional enactment to clear its skirts from any syndicalist taint.

Thirdly, it is a significant thing that the old ultra-radical Socialist Labor Party contingent, which helped to organize the I. W. W., withdrew in a body from that organization when it turned from political to direct action.

Fourthly, it is a matter of common knowledge that the Railway Brotherhoods and the American Federation of Labor, whose combined membership includes by conservative estimates ninety per cent of the union workers of this country, have consistently refused to countenance syndicalistic theory or syndicalistic organization. Both have advanced steadily in the direction of legislative and political action, until now the Federation has practically committed itself to the ultimate formation of a labor political party.

It is true, on the other hand, that we have heard much of late of American syndicalist societies and leagues, formed with the avowed purpose of "penetrating" the American labor movement. But I challenge any pro-syndicalist to expose the weakness of these so-called organizations by bringing forward any authenticated statement of their membership and operations. To all intents and purposes they are in fact paper organizations, mere imitative projects, without a root imbedded as yet in the fertile soil of the American labor movement.

There remains then as the sole possibly significant organic representative of syndicalism in this country, the Industrial Workers

of the World. Here at last, if anywhere, we are face to face with the bugbear of American syndicalism. And what of the I. W. W.?

A few months since, moved by a desire to get at the truth underlying the flood of literature on this subject, I tried to make an honest, first-hand investigation of the I. W. W. I attended its convention, ate, drank, and talked with its members, soaked myself in its factional discussion, haunted its headquarters, fraternized with its officers and leaders, delved in its literature and history. The outcome of this investigation went to show:

First, that the syndicalistic character of the I. W. W. is not altogether authenticated by the facts. The so-called syndicalism of this organization seems to be after all not much more than decentralization gone mad,—a thing for the most part compounded of a species of anarchistic idealism and a blind, instinctive impulse to react somehow against capitalism and capitalistic society in the absence of the ordinary organic, financial, and political means and opportunities. But even this decentralizing madness does not appear to be a brand true syndicalism, for, among the rank and file who are committed to it, and even among its protagonists, there is a notable lack of positive, guiding comprehension of what syndicalist theory is and implies. Moreover, there is a strong faction in the organization whose aim is still one big union with centralized authority and financial power, and whose emphasis is placed on stability of organization and immediate results.

But, secondly, assuming that all this may not invalidate the essentially syndicalistic character of the organization, these further facts are proved unequivocally,—namely, that the I. W. W. is a flat failure, and, far from being the grim, brooding power which it has been pictured, is a body pathetically weak in membership, without consistent leadership, organically chaotic, and torn by apparent irreconcilable internal conflict resulting from a discrepancy of fundamental ideals. How really insignificant this wholly unstable organization is, may be shown by positive and comparative statements of its membership.

After eight years of agitation and organization effort, after a series of most spectacular contests, after unparalleled advertisement, after having shown the workers how easy a thing it is to “strike terror to the heart of capitalism,” the I. W. W. showed a membership paid up to the national office for 1913 of 14,310. That is, it had paid up:

(1) less than one one-hundredth of the membership of the A. F. L.;

(2) less than one-sixtieth of the voters of the socialist ticket in 1912;

(3) less than one-twentieth of the membership of a single industrial union in the A. F. L.;

(4) less than six one-thousandths of the general body of organized American workmen;

(5) less than one in 2000 of American wage workers.

In short, the I. W. W., like all other attempted unions of an ultra-revolutionary character or based on some cut-and-dried theory, with a cut-and-dried scheme of organization and tactics, has failed to grip the imagination and to command the loyalty of American workingmen. Like all such experiments on American soil, it has been a flash in the pan, notable in this case chiefly for the excessive amount of smoke and noise. No doubt it has stimulated the action of its opponents; notably it has caused fear and stimulated thoughtfulness where thoughtfulness was needed, but as a positive, organic factor in the American labor movement it has proved itself an almost negligible factor.

After this brief survey the conclusion, so far as it concerns the problem of syndicalism in the United States, would seem to be obvious. But I am well aware that those who feel a vital, constitutional need for visualizing and magnifying such a problem will not abandon their beliefs merely on this showing of evidence. They will doubtless point to the undeniable growth of industrial unionism within the A. F. L. and to the many sporadic outbreaks of violent and predatory action with which the history of our labor movement has been checkered as indicating the development of syndicalism in spirit and action within American labor movement quite apart from any formal organization or teaching,—a great ground swell, they will say, carrying the whole movement onward toward the syndicalist bourne. But let us see whether these are really syndicalistic manifestations. I doubt it, and for these two reasons:

First, I venture to affirm that there is no more necessary connection between industrial unionism and syndicalism than between capitalism and monarchy. Industrial unionism on the face of it is merely an attempt to parallel capitalist organization. It is perfectly compatible with collective bargaining and with what we might call business unionism, as is illustrated by the case of the United Mine Workers. It is the ideal type of unionism advocated by the socialists. On the other hand, it may grow up

along with non-socialist political action, as in the A. F. L., where a strong tendency toward industrial organization has gone hand in hand with a robust development of legislative and political activity. Evidently, then, it indicates a hopeless confusion of ideas to identify syndicalism with industrial unionism, and is a misuse of reason to predicate the one as necessarily the result of the other. How then about union violence and predation? Do they show any necessary affinity between unionism and syndicalism? In order to answer this question correctly let us look for a moment at the most usual occasion for deliberate violence and predation on the part of old line unionists. It is a fact that almost any body of union men, whatever their principles and ordinary methods, and for that matter almost any body of workers, will tend to resort to violence and perhaps predation if they are face to face with systematic and long-continued aggression or are brought up against a blank wall of resistance to demands for the absolute essentials of a safe and decent existence, *provided there is no relief in sight through law or public opinion*. But the same is true of any body of men with red blood in their veins, or of women for that matter. Shall we then dissipate our concept of syndicalism by making it cover the action of the Boston Tea Party, the Ku Klux Klan, the Mexican revolutionists, and the militant suffragettes? Surely we must not confuse spasmodic outbreaks against specific oppression with direct action as the corollary of a fixed and general aversion to peaceful opportunist effort and political action. Only, then, when union violence and predation have been the outgrowth of a permanent aversion of this kind, or when such aversion has grown up with the violence and has become the fixed creed of a union, can we rightfully speak of them as syndicalistic in character.

But shall we nowhere find this permanent attitude outside of the I. W. W.? The A. R. U. was not adverse to political action; the W. F. M. has again joined forces with the A. F. L.; the Bridge and Structural Iron Workers apparently show no signs of going over to the syndicalist camp.

Must we not then conclude that in drawing of the I. W. W. into the picture in its proper character and proportion, we have pretty thoroughly disposed of syndicalism as a serious American problem?

So far, so good, but have we any assurance that we shall not

soon have to face a serious syndicalist problem in America? To satisfy ourselves on this point we should have to discuss our third question, namely, What are the causes of syndicalism, and what are the prospects of its future development? I shall not attempt to discuss this question fully but shall be content to make one or two suggestive statements indicating why syndicalism has not developed and is not likely to develop on American soil, and the conditions which would be necessary for its development here.

Successful trade unionism, as it exists in America today, is not a made-to-order affair; it is not imitative of anything to be found abroad, nor is it the objectification of any general social theory. It is a means, slowly forged by experience, of meeting the immediate needs and solving the immediate problems of the American workers. It has been developed by the trial-and-error method. It is experimental, opportunistic, pragmatic. And if you will look back over the past century and a quarter you will find that this is the only kind of labor organization that has survived and *worked* in this country. Even socialism, before it could make any successful appeal to American workmen, had to cut loose from the ultra-revolutionists, thrust its theories into the background, and develop a program for meeting immediate needs and problems.

The immediate reason for all this lies in the character of the organizing element of American workmen. The great mass of organized American workmen are not conscious revolutionists, but are optimistic opportunists. They want more here and now. Their attention is fixed on meeting immediate needs and solving immediate problems. They see hope ahead in a gradual improvement of existing conditions. They have little capacity for or patience with speculative theorizing. They are unwilling to leave the path which has been marked out by experience, with its slow but sure advance, to plunge into theoretically assumed shortcuts charted only by imagination. This is the general attitude of that portion of the American working class which has alone proved itself capable of sustained organic effort.

This attitude is the outcome partly of the racial character of American workmen, and partly of American economic and social conditions. The hardheaded, tradition-bound, empirical element predominates in our labor movement, just as it does in our business affairs, in law and politics, and in our social ideals and affairs generally, and this characteristic, perhaps racial, has been reinforced by the fact that the economic and social conditions have

for generations been such that the workers *could* see hope ahead in gradual betterment through constructive industrial and political action. The labor movement thus given character has assimilated and Americanized foreign accretions, just as in general we have assimilated and Americanized the immigrant, socially and politically.

It is true in the one case as in the other assimilation and transmutation have not been complete, but if our labor history has proved anything, as indicated especially by the career of the I. W. W., it is that those elements which have not been assimilated are incapable of consistent and effective organic union and action, and that the spasmodic organic efforts of such a body as the I. W. W. fail to check the growth and do not essentially modify the ideals and methods of the American and Americanized labor movement.

On account of all this there is no syndicalist problem of consequence in this country. We shall have none of consequence, I believe, unless and until the great organic American labor movement finds its way barred to empirical advance. It is now feeling its way toward the organizing of the unskilled, and will doubtless organize them as fast as the psychology of the situation will permit; it is advancing experimentally toward the industrial form of organization, as anyone must concede who is at all familiar with the organic history and the declarations of the A. F. L.; it is at the same time forging ahead on the line of political action as fast as tradition will safely allow; it is gradually overcoming the employers' claims of autocratic rights and establishing the principles and working rules of industrial democracy. Whenever it comes face to face with a blank wall of resistance in law and administration, whenever it encounters trusts and employers' associations bent upon its extermination, it is apt to adopt secret, violent, and predatory methods. But when the temporary occasion is past it quickly returns to its ordinary ideals and tactics. And if I read the character and spirit of the American labor movement aright, it would take a deal of useless battering against an impenetrable wall of legal and industrial resistance to create in the American labor movement the general psychology compatible with a real and robust development of syndicalism.

EARL DEAN HOWARD: My remarks are to be construed as laboratory notes on an experiment still in progress. If the ex-

periment should begin to show different reactions in the future, the conclusions might require revision.

The three last months of 1910 saw the men's clothing industry in Chicago completely tied up by a strike. The industry had been almost entirely unorganized. Hart, Schaffner & Marx, the largest manufacturers, signed an arbitration agreement for two years with the leaders, establishing a board of arbitration to hear grievances and granting a general advance of ten per cent in wages. During three years the experiment has encountered obstacles, the most serious of which was the expiration of the two years' agreement in April, 1913, but the scheme has survived them all and appears to be established now upon a basis that conserves more of the interests of both parties than any other we know. The garment workers are largely foreign born and most of them recent emigrants: Jews, Poles, Bohemians, Italians, Lithuanians, Roumanians, etc., and about in the order named. They are in general typical of the class to which this I. W. W. most successfully appeals. The results obtained from this three-year experiment must therefore be of value in establishing the significance of the I. W. W. movement.

Wherever there is large-scale production employing masses of unskilled or semi-skilled labor, there has been a complete separation of the employer and employee. The agents of the employer who come in direct contact with the people do not have the same interests and motives as the employer: even in the absence of any benevolent motives, the business sagacity of the employer is sufficient to maintain conditions which are usually not too grievous and exasperating to the worker. The agent has neither of these motives as a rule; furthermore, he lacks the complete authority to adjust grievances promptly and is inclined to shift responsibility.

One of our conclusions is that the usual cause of revolutionary outbreaks, turbulence, and acute dissatisfaction leading thereto is *unsettled* grievances. The patience of this class of workers with settled conditions, even though bad, is remarkable and it is exceedingly difficult to arouse them to protest against such conditions. However, let some new dispute arise, even over a comparatively trivial matter, and allow it to continue without adjustment, especially if it seems to the people to involve an injustice, and it will be easy to cause a general outbreak, even though the unsettled grievance touches only a small number of individuals. Once trouble is started, all other grievances, real and imaginary,



previously quiescent, are brought forward to reinforce the original unadjusted dispute.

The substitution of some agency to restore the lost contact between employer and employee, to adjust all complaints promptly, to oversee all changes of operation which may cause misunderstanding and trouble, to take charge of all discipline and of collective bargaining, and to deal with the people or their natural representatives, will go far toward preventing serious disturbances.

Contrary to the general opinion, this class of people, ignorant and unreasoning, have more respect for law and authority than some of the so-called higher classes. To prevent disturbances, it is necessary to have some impartial and disinterested authority to decide disputes on some principle of justice. The New York Cloak and Suit Protocol, the most significant experiment in the adjustment of the relations between employer and employee that is now being tested, has a very grave and remediable weakness at this point. The Board of Grievances has no power to settle disputes except by agreement, and the higher body, the Board of Arbitration, which has such power, is not organized to render prompt and inexpensive justice in minor disputes. The result is a very grave structural weakness which may seriously menace the whole experiment.

The I. W. W. movement has undoubtedly tended to bring closer together the employers and the leaders of organized labor; the greater the danger, the closer will become the alliance. Each side will endeavor to make itself more tolerable to the other in the presence of the common danger. The orthodox labor unions have a great vested interest in trade agreements and arbitration and have much to lose by revolutionary disturbances.

The only industries in which the I. W. W. has gained temporary acceptance are those neglected by the A. F. L., such as textiles, or where unionism has been repressed, as in mining. The A. F. L. has taken warning and is organizing the previously neglected industries. The employers may well reconsider whether repression of unionism, as in the steel industry, is not creating a social condition dangerous to the whole community.

A balky and vicious horse is frequently a horse previously abused; his protest and rebellion against abuse has become habitual. Lawless insurrection of the unorganized and vicious and violent practices of organized labor are likely to be the legitimate effects of the abuses of capitalistic power. Violence begets

violence. So long as the abuses of the capitalistic system are so extensive, is it not probable that in the abuses rather than in the system itself lies the disturbing cause? Revolutions come because evolutionary progress has been obstructed by some institutions which can be moved only by a general destructive force, sweeping away both good and bad together.

The failure of the I. W. W. to gain control in the strike of the men's clothing tailors in New York in 1913 is instructive. A great mass of ignorant people on strike, socialistically persuaded that the whole capitalistic system was an abomination, seemingly offered an inviting field, especially as these people had lost confidence in the higher officials of the Garment Workers' Union. My own observations under similar circumstances convince me that the Jew, even the excitable, socialistic Russian Jew, is hostile to the I. W. W. philosophy. He has too much respect for the bargaining and arbitrating systems in adjusting human relations and is fundamentally opposed to violent expropriation as a substitute therefor. A group of Jewish workers in an industry may prove a rock of defense against the encroachments of the I. W. W., provided this group is not incited by repression to make common cause with the I. W. W.

It has been generally assumed that the cause of discontent and a rebellious feeling on the part of the industrial masses is due to working conditions over which the industrial managers have more or less control—wages, hours, personal treatment of employees, working environment, sanitation, etc. May not this assumption be due to the fact that the visible protest of the workers is always directed against the employers in the form of a strike? The cause of unsatisfactory conditions of living seems to the worker to be low wages and the remedy seems to him to be higher wages. It is possible that the cause may lie just as much in conditions which surround the worker as a citizen and consumer: dirty streets, bad housing, expensive and inferior food and fuel, crowding of population, bad transportation, occasional unemployment, etc. Higher wages would undoubtedly enable the individual worker to escape from these conditions by moving to a different neighborhood, but is not the employer of labor a scapegoat for the sins of the community, and must he not bear the opprobrium and burden of the protest of the victim of these conditions which are really the result of bad politics, land monopoly, inefficiency of municipal services, uneconomic methods of commod-

ity distribution (particularly food), coal monopoly, badly regulated and greedy public service monopolies, unscientific currency laws, and in general of abuses and failures in the economic and political systems under which we live?

ROGER W. BABSON: Owing to the fact that Mr. Brooks's paper so largely quotes from me, I can perhaps best discuss it by explaining how, in my relation to capital, I can show sympathy with any unpopular social movements. To do this I must relate to those of you who do not already know just what and for whom my organization is working. This explanation may also make you realize that I am not talking from mere theory, but only after severe and expensive rubbing up against cold facts.

First, let me describe the three circles or areas drawn on the blackboard. These show how the great game of business is being played today.

In the center, there is the inner circle, so called, which stands for financial despotism, and which is endeavoring to hold its grip through welfare work, profit sharing, and other similar means. In this inner group are certain great banks, certain great newspapers, some manufacturers, a few merchants, and even some investors. The god of this group is money, and it really believes that money can and will accomplish anything. It looks only to what a man has got, irrespective of how he got it, or what he is doing with it.

On the outside, there are to be found the surging masses. It is not necessary in this paper for me to state what I think of this untrained surplus of humanity, or how I should handle it, excepting to say that in my humble opinion these people can be reached only through vocational training, supported by heavy inheritance taxes. The god of this group is their stomachs, and heretofore they have had only the knowledge learned through the sad lessons of depression, disease, and punishment.

Between the inner and outer circles there is a good-sized middle group which is honestly endeavoring to render service to the community and get paid therefor. This circle also contains certain banks, newspapers, as well as many worthy manufacturers and workmen. Now it is for this great middle group (of which I believe you men are a part) that my organization is fighting. But notice that this middle group is hemmed in by irresponsible wealth on one side, and irresponsible hunger on the other.

Secondly, let me say that in fighting for this middle group we learn a great many things. I wish it were possible for me to even hint at what we learn. I shouldn't dare tell you for fear of the incomplete stories which would go out through the press; and even if I did you would not believe that such things are possible.

In confirmation of Mr. Brooks's charges, let me say, however, that at this very moment as you sit here I have over one hundred employees who are studying reports which you men may not know exist; who are tracking bankers and big corporations in their secret negotiations with organized labor; and who are discovering the constant subsidizing of magazines, as well as of detective bureaus, teaching, and politics.

What do all these reports from all parts of the world teach me concerning syndicalism? Briefly, they teach that the statement of the case by Mr. Brooks is substantially correct. Such investigations teach that the salvation of this great middle group, for which we are fighting, depends among others upon three things:

1. Upon preventing this great outside group from being combined in one body either by irresponsible organized labor or by irresponsible organized religion. Hence anything which we believe will help curtail either, we cannot condemn. In other words, the salvation of this great middle group to which we all belong depends upon splitting organized labor and organized religion into two camps, and to the extent that the syndicalist movement may be needed to do this we must recognize its usefulness. All consumers who know when they are well off will fight with us. In fact, our only hope as consumers lies in splitting labor into different camps to bid against one another.

2. A second fact that my organization has learned shows that it is in the interests of the great middle group to have the irresponsible rich in the inner circle worried as much as possible. You can't raise money enough to bribe them; the law won't let us hang them; and between us the most effective treatment is to watch and worry them.

Now the syndicalists are doing this "to the queen's taste." To the extent that these poor ignorant syndicalists are worrying irresponsible wealth, the less time these men in the "charmed circle" will have to devise means for taking advantage of honest producers of labor, capital, and enterprise. This includes all the many engaged in creative work whether as loaners or borrowers, employers or workers, preachers or teachers.

3. Lastly, we have the important point Mr. Brooks has brought out,—namely, that syndicalism and real coöperation are bound to lead to the same goal. The reports which my organization are receiving from all over the world lead me to believe that there cannot long be two captains to the ship, as the American Federation of Labor pretends to believe, and as some good altruists who have spoken this morning apparently do believe at this moment.

Joint control is all very well to talk about, and a step in the right direction; but sooner or later there must be a real fight between inherited capital and creative ability. Today inherited capital rules; but it is in the interest of those in the middle group to have the aristocracy of inherited wealth dethroned, and an aristocracy of creative ability installed in its place. This is the fight of the syndicalists.

Don't fear. The syndicalists will never win any more than did poor old John Brown and his men sixty years ago; but like John Brown and his noble band, they, the syndicalists, may be blazing the way so that some day your children and mine will be judged according to what they really are and by what they do and not according to how many stock certificates they have inherited from a great-grandfather.

Hence, in closing let me again say that I fully endorse the fundamentals of Mr. Brooks's paper. Whether considered in connection with our relation to either the inner circle of irresponsible wealth or to the outer circle of irresponsible voters, the syndicalists may, if they survive, render us in this middle group a great service. When thinking of these poor fellows, I am always reminded of the words of our Master, who once said something about "Who-soever saveth his life shall lose it," and then later, "Except a grain of wheat fall to the ground and perish, it shall"—well, you know the rest.

Let us ask ourselves if the syndicalists may not be performing the same function in the community as the fire alarm of a country village. There is nothing creative about a fire-alarm system. It may ring, ring, ring, and the fire burn, burn, burn; but it arouses the people who go out and unitedly fight the fire, and in saving their brother's property they save their own.

May not these syndicalists wake the world up to the realization that the problems cannot be solved through socialism, communism, laissez-faireism, commissionism, or the regulation-of-

everythingism; but only through a creative educational system which will train all men, whether in the inner, the middle, or the outer circle, to seek the things worth while?

As President Kinley and Professor Ely suggested last night the intellect is only the superstructure; there must be pillars of industry with foundations of righteousness.

F. S. DEIBLER: There are three criticisms I would make on this paper. But my criticisms are not intended to detract from the credit due Mr. Brooks for the service that he has rendered in this paper, as well as in his recent book, *American Syndicalism*, by setting forth in a sympathetic but judicious tone the broad, social aspects of this new phase of the labor movement. I have in mind only to indicate at what points, as it appears to me, his treatment fails to convey an accurate picture of the movement. If syndicalism constitutes a problem, or if it strikes at serious evils in existing economic conditions, the facts should be clearly and accurately stated. Not much progress can be made in solving social problems, or in readjusting the social and economic policies of a state, until the essential nature of the problems to be treated is well understood.

With this rule as a guide, I would say, first, that Mr. Brooks does not give in this paper sufficient information concerning the causes of syndicalism. If syndicalism is an inevitable result of the inherent nature of the wage system, then the method of procedure should take the form of a fundamental reconstruction that would supplant that system. But if it is simply an outgrowth of the present operation of that system, perhaps such readjustments can be made as will furnish labor the protection and justice which the syndicalist so much desires. If, however, it is the result of the aberration of the restless spirits in the community, or the contest of the "outs against the ins," perhaps judicious social control and time will bring all the change that is necessary. It is not my intention to undertake the task of developing the causes for syndicalism in the time at my disposal, but a brief resumé will assist in presenting my viewpoint.

When we reflect that fifty years ago the prevailing economic doctrine was one of individualism, and that there existed at that time large areas of undeveloped public lands, which constantly drained off the surplus labor; and when we remember that in the interval this land has passed almost completely under cultivation

and private ownership, and that as a nation we are becoming relatively industrial, as distinguished from agricultural, we can understand, I think, why, on the one hand, those who have benefited by the economic conditions of the past give up grudgingly the old economic philosophy, and look with disfavor on anything that is in the nature of an attack on existing conditions or tends in the direction of collectivism. On the other hand, we can understand why those who have been cut off from the opportunities that flow from access to natural resources, and who have felt the injustice of these changes, have become discontented with existing conditions and have demanded in no uncertain terms that the evils be remedied. Their protests have been vigorous, because they themselves are vigorous and ambitious members of the community. Social discontent can be accounted for by the economic changes which I have here briefly summarized. My own impression is that syndicalism is only the more radical and extreme expression of the social discontent that accompanies the economic changes of a dynamic age.

Not all of those who protest against modern conditions can be classed as syndicalists. Some of the most scathing criticisms of modern industry and industrial methods come from the pens of labor leaders, who would resent vigorously being classed as syndicalists. Again, you can find among union officials some who in their way are as class conscious as any socialist or syndicalist, and yet who are as bitter toward these as toward the employer.

My second criticism is that the paper does not adequately discriminate between these three groups in whose ranks economic changes have been most keenly felt and discontent most vigorously expressed. The differences between the syndicalist, the socialist, and the trade unionist is one of methods and of ultimate aims for the removal of the injustices which they are now compelled to endure.

My third criticism is that Mr. Brooks has overstated the importance of the movement. This certainly is true if the I. W. W. is to be taken as the sole representative of syndicalism in this country. I say this with the full knowledge of the disturbance which a small group may cause, especially when it is guided by strong personalities, who take advantage of times of contest to make their appeal to class prejudice and class heroism. As an organization the I. W. W. is certainly not a very formidable body. Nor is there any evidence of immediate development of

real strength. The labor movement has repeatedly shown examples of organizations which have attempted to build on too ambitious a scale. Such attempts have invariably resulted in failure. If the history of the labor movement teaches any lesson, it is that effective organization is necessary for the protection of the rights of the workmen. Effective organization requires, among other things, a strong centralized authority; it requires skill and experience on the part of the officials, which can be secured only as the result of long tenure in office; and it requires a well developed financial system. Tested by these standards, the I. W. W. holds little of hope for the workmen. Its leaders apparently lack historical perspective. They seem not to understand that social institutions are the result of a long process of social evolution and adaptation and that any radical change without a well developed program of social reconstruction would lead to social chaos. If by any accident the I. W. W. were to attain its demands, neither its method nor its program holds much assurance that the new state would not be worse than the first.

However, I am in hearty accord with Mr. Brooks in the view expressed that we should listen with open-mindedness to the protests of the syndicalists. A policy of oppression would result in creating martyrs out of many misguided individuals, and it would become increasingly difficult to separate the wheat from the chaff in their demands in the name of labor. If the evils of the present economic conditions require a complete social and economic reconstruction, then the socialist program holds much more of assurance than does syndicalism. The socialist program does contain the outline of a constructive plan, which, it is conceivable, might evolve out of present institutions. Not so with syndicalism. The most that can be expected from syndicalism is that, through its spectacular methods and emotional protests, the public conscience will be aroused more quickly to a recognition of the existence of economic injustices.

I am of the opinion that we are making progress toward collectivism just as fast as we can wisely handle the problems which such reorganization will necessitate. Where we have already extended social control, we have a big problem in developing administrative machinery and a public conscience that will make that control effective. The complexities of modern economic and social problems require a high degree of specialized and technical knowledge. This expert knowledge can be brought to bear



on the administration of social policies only as the need for it becomes generally recognized, and as trained men with high ideals of social service are willing to go into this work as a life profession. The movement toward more democratic control of our social institutions, and the demand for the curbing of special privileges of all kinds, together with the development of a higher sense of statesmanship and social service, will do more toward protecting the rights of labor and in removing the injustices of the present conditions than can be hoped from syndicalism in its present form.

G. W. NOYES: That no society, whatever its form, can permanently succeed without maintaining an adjustment of consumption to production is axiomatic. In the world today this adjustment is brought about by competition, involving the existence of a marginal class, the weaker members of which are unable at times to obtain even the necessities of life. I apprehend that the fundamental weakness of syndicalism will be found in the fact that by removing competition, and abolishing the marginal class, it breaks down the force which, hard though it is on certain individuals, now performs for society the vital function of counteracting the inherent tendency of consumption to outrun production.

But the existing form of society, with the growth of democracy, is rapidly tending toward the same situation. A minimum wage, state regulation of industry, sickness and unemployment insurance, old age pensions,—these are but steps in a comprehensive legislative program by which society is undertaking to guarantee the economic welfare of all its members. This program, if carried to its logical conclusion, will, like syndicalism, eliminate competition, and remove the force which now insures to society as a whole a surplus product.

Under democratic control the only conceivable force, which in the absence of competition can maintain a constant adjustment between consumption and production, is, as Mr. Babson suggests, education. That social group which first and best establishes an educational system that develops the qualities of voluntary industry and self-restraint, will in spite of all its rivals completely dominate the future.

J. E. LE ROSSIGNOL: I should like to call attention to an ex-

traordinary development of syndicalism in New Zealand, which Professor Hammond has briefly mentioned in his paper. It seems to have been introduced into that country from two sources: from Australia, where Tom Mann was very active for some years, and from the United States, through the efforts of "Professor" W. T. Mills, of Milwaukee, and other agents of the I. W. W.

The chief syndicalist organization in New Zealand is the New Zealand Federation of Labour, commonly called the "Red Fed," a revolutionary body, opposed to industrial arbitration, repudiating agreements, and advocating sabotage and the general strike. This organization had much to do with the Waihi strike of May 15 to November 30, 1912, which was finally broken down, largely through the formation of new unions registered under the Arbitration Act, which the strikers designated as "scab unions." As the Waihi Miners Union had canceled its registration under the act, the strike was not illegal.

Since that time the "Red Fed" officials have been very active in spreading syndicalist doctrines and in preaching the social revolution. They were evidently awaiting a good opportunity to call a general strike, and this presented itself toward the end of October, 1913. On October 17 the shipwrights of Wellington asked for an increase in wages; and, when this was refused, they ceased work. On October 22 the Waterside Workers Union held a sympathetic meeting on the wharf during working hours; and when, two hours later, they returned to work, they found their places filled by other union laborers. The Union demanded that the "stop-work" men be immediately reinstated in their positions; and when the employers refused, alleging that a breach of agreement had been committed, a strike was called, the control of which was handed over to the "Red Fed."

From this small beginning, the trouble spread rapidly, with mass meetings on the wharves, picketing, intimidation, strikes of waterside workers in other seaports, strikes of coal miners and seamen, and considerable violence, culminating on November 5 in a serious battle in Wellington between a thousand special policemen and a mob of strikers and their sympathizers. Many of these "specials" were farmers who came down to break up the strike so that their mutton, wool, and other products might be shipped.

On Monday, November 10, the "Federation" called a general

strike, and thousands of laborers in various parts of the Dominion responded to the call, although by far the greater number disobeyed. In Auckland alone about 5000 laborers came out, including waterside workers, carters, hotel and restaurant workers, timber workers, furniture workers, carpenters, tinsmiths, certificated engineers, painters, and general laborers. Presently, however, the strike began to weaken, for several causes, among which should be mentioned the suppression of violence by the government, with the aid of special police, and the formation of new unions of free laborers registered under the Arbitration Act. By November 29 the new Waterside Workers Union of Wellington numbered about 1600 men, including many of the former strikers, and the loading and unloading of ships was going on much as before the strike.

It should be noted that many of the chief labor leaders, as the Hon. J. Barr, the Hon. J. T. Paul, and Mr. J. Reardon, made strong declarations against the strike. The United Labour Party issued a manifesto denouncing the "Red Fed," opposing the general strike, and declaring for constitutional methods. By the latest papers, dated December 5, it appears that shipping operations were going on actively at all ports, although the strike was still on, and there was some trouble at Australian ports about the unloading of ships coming from New Zealand.

CHRISTOPHER EASTON: It appears to me that most of the preceding speakers have attempted to analyze a spiritual movement by scientific methods. The movement has an economic side, and a very vulnerable one, and it would have been better, I think, for an Association of this character to have confined the discussion to this side of the movement instead of attempting to measure the force of the movement as a whole. To measure the strength of the I. W. W. by its paid-up membership, as one of the speakers did, is absurd, especially when one considers the fact that the majority of the members of that organization are without steady employment and many of them are in jail. Suppose the measure of paid-up membership had been applied to the groups that met in the catacombs in Rome in the first century!

An expression of feeling may be out of place in an assemblage of this kind, but sometimes a question like this will come home to one in a personal way that compels doubt as to the wisdom of the harsh measures applied to the I. W. W. and apparently upheld by this body. A few years ago there was a likeable young

man working for one of the large corporations in New York who was being promoted and had excellent chances of a successful business career. I knew this young man very well. He left his good position at the call of the *Wanderlust* and after several years of travelling around the country joined the Mexican revolutionists. When the Madero revolution was over he joined the I. W. W. and has had much experience with jails since. In fact, he is a hunted man, with whom I have to communicate indirectly. His splendid constitution has been broken down by the "third degree," but still he sticks by his friends and a hopeless cause.

Now this movement may blow over. Certainly the forces of law and order must triumph in the end over a principle lacking cohesiveness. Yet the movement will leave a mark upon the day we are living in and it does not behoove us to make light of it or to lose sight of the human side of it. It will probably work out in the direction of modifying a too centralized collectivism.

W. J. TRIMBLE: Syndicalism, so-called, or the I. W. W. movement, is simply one symptom of the vast social unrest abroad in the United States in our time. This unrest is peculiarly marked in the case of the wage-earning and salaried classes, who have no ownership of natural resources, and their unrest is acute because of the perception that opportunities are fewer than in the past. It is becoming less and less possible for a man *to step out of his class*; if he rises at all in the future it will have to be generally as a member of his class. The old opportunities for initiative are vanishing.

Our nation, in fact, is passing through a fundamental process of adjustment—the most far-reaching and the most compelling in its history. Back of most of the problems which we are facing is the fact that *we are passing from a free land era to a restricted land era*.

We have not yet adjusted ourselves to the new conditions. Men with the individualistic instincts of the past age shrink from the limitations of a comparatively fixed order. Consequently, we have widespread trepidation, questioning, alarm, tumult, unorganization. We know not in reality whither we are tending.

Knowledge of the limitation of our natural resources may lead, however, to better organization for the good of all our people. The passing of the public lands, together with political equality and modern means of communication and enlightenment, may result in a great step forward in *industrial democracy*.